



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,454	03/22/2001	Viyyokaran Raman Ramachandran	6647-20	7637

45842 7590 02/26/2007
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - NOVELL
210 SW MORRISON STREET
SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

JUNG, DAVID YIUK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/815,454

Applicant(s)

RAMACHANDRAN ET AL.

Examiner

David Y. Jung

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-47 are presented.

Arguments regarding Claims 1-46

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as to claims 1-46. See the section regarding the inapplicability of the Windows 2000 reference.

Response to Arguments regarding Claim 47

Regarding claim 47, Applicant is entirely correct. On this ground, Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments regarding Inapplicability of Windows 2000 reference Used in the rejection under 35 USC 103

Even, assuming arguendo, that Applicant is correct regarding the inapplicability of the Windows 2000 reference (used in the rejections under 35 USC 103), Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection with the Kormann reference. See the rejection under 35 USC 102.

Art Unit: 2134

Microsoft Passport is the first well known federated identify management protocol. For a survey on federated identity management, see Pfitzmann (Birgit Pfitzmann, Michael Waidner: Federated Identity-Management Protocols; 11th International Workshop on Security Protocols (2003), LNCS 3364, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 2005, 153-174. See especially Section 2. Existing Proposals and Design Goals, which identifies Microsoft Passport as the first.

The view of Pfitzmann is confirmed by Kaminsky (Michael Kaminsky. User Authentication and Remote Execution Across Administrative Domains. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, September 2004), which makes references throughout the paper to Microsoft.

Furthermore, Applicant's arguments regarding the inapplicability of Windows 2000 seem less persuasive when considered in the light of the opinions of the leading scholars (Pfitzmann, Waidner, Kaminsky) on this subject. These scholars assert Passport from Microsoft as the first well known protocol in the field. Because they also discuss Windows as a successor to Passport, Applicant's arguments regarding the inapplicability of Windows 2000 seem less persuasive.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 2134

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Kormann (David P. Kormann and Aviel D. Rubin, Risks of the Passport Single Signon Protocol, Computer Networks, Elsevier Science Press, volume 33, pages 51-58, June, 2000).

Claim 1: A cross-domain authentication apparatus (figure 1. the passport architecture, i.e., the domain of IBM.com and domain of the user as represented by the browser),

the apparatus comprising:

a first computer on a first domain and a second computer on a second domain;

a network connecting the first and second computers (the Internet, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol);

a secret shared between the first and second computers (the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol); and

a federation access policy identifying access permission on the first computer on the first domain a user local to the second computer on the second domain over the network (the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol).

Microsoft Passport is the first well known federated identity management protocol and already had 40 million users as of June, 2000.

Claim 19 is another independent claim.

Claim 19: A method for performing cross domain authentication (figure 1. the passport architecture, i.e., the domain of IBM.com and domain of the user as represented by the browser),

the method comprising:

receiving a request for a resource on a first computer on a first domain from a user local to a second computer on a second domain over a network (the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol);

challenging the user to be authenticated (the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol);

authenticating the user (the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol);

informing the first computer on the first domain that the user is authenticated (the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol);
and

accessing the resource from the first computer on the first domain using the second computer on the second domain (the access of the consumer and the merchant of each other's money and products and computer data, as noted at section 3. How Passport works).

Claims 2, 3, 22, 25, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 45 deal with HTTP and proxies. See the fourth (the last) paragraph of Section 1. Introduction that discusses HTTP redirection and thus proxies.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 4-8, 10-12, 14-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 33, 36-44, 46, 47 deal with cross domain authentication so as to be able to resources. See the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol.

Claim 9 deals with permitting a second user to have access without requiring assistance from an administrator. See the second and the third paragraphs of Section 1. Introduction that discusses how Passport differs from Kerberos. See also section 4.1.5 Persistent cookies that discusses how Passport differs from Kerberos. See also figure 1. the passport architecture, i.e., the domain of IBM.com and domain of the user as represented by the browser. See also the authentication using passport server, as noted at section 3.1 Single signon protocol.

On the feature of the administrator, Passport differs from Windows 2000. In Windows 2000, with the permission and assistance of one administrator, a second user (e.g., another administrator) may have access without requiring assistance from the other administrator.

Passport does not promote the administrator to block users in such fashion; Passport differs from some versions of Windows in how Kerberos is used. Passport permits a second user to have access without requiring assistance from an administrator. This was one of the reasons why there were already 40 million users as of June, 2000.

Claims 13 deals with SSL. See the fourth (the last) paragraph of Section 1. Introduction that discusses SSL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windows 2000 (cited in the previous Office Action).

Claims 1-46 are rejected as in the previous Office Action.

Regarding claim 47 (A cross-domain authentication apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the first domain is different from the second domain), Windows 2000 teaches the use of multiple domains in which the domains are different. See section "Process of Logging On."

Conclusion

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Points of Contact

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2134

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


(571) 273-3836 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836 or Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (272) 272-3811.

David Jung

Patent Examiner

2/21/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'David Jung', written over a dashed line. The signature is stylized with a large loop at the beginning and a long, sweeping tail.